



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(beaven01.001)

5 **Applicant:** Douglas F. Beaven **Paper No.:**

Application No: 09/312,740 **Group Art Unit:** 3623

10 **Filed:** 5/14/99 **Examiner:** Krisciunas, Linda Mary

Title: *Processing management information*

.....

15 Commissioner for Patents
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Submission accompanying an RCE under 37 C.F.R. 1.114(c)

Summary of prosecution

Applicant filed an RCE in the present examination on 10/19/2005, and in response thereto, Examiner withdrew the finality of the rejection mailed 7/19/05. A non-final Office action followed on 12/13/05. In that Office action, Examiner rejected claims 187, 191, and 192 under 35 U.S.C. 112 because of their use of the terms "observe" and "perceive", which were deemed to be subjective and non-measurable. Claims 187-194, 197-206, and 210 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over Board (High End Project Managers, Infoworld, Feb. 1, 1993, p. 61-69) in view of Aoyama (Web Based Agile Software Development by Mikio Aoyama, IEEE Software Nov/Dec 1998, pp. 56-65).

Examiner graciously granted a telephonic interview in the application on 3/10/06; in a response based on arguments made in the interview and filed 3/15/06, Applicant amended independent claims 187 and 192 to render the relationship between the hierarchies and the representations of the model entities unambiguous and also amended claim 187 to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. Further amendments were made to dependent claims 188-191 to bring them into conformity with amended claim 187.

Examiner mailed a final Office action on 4/7/06 in the above application in which she rejected claims 187-194 and 197-210 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by a new reference, U.S. Patent 6,442,557, Buteau et al., *Evaluation of enterprise architectural model including relational database*, filed 2/27/98 (henceforth "Buteau") and objected to dependent Beauregard claims 197 and 210 for failing to limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant amended claim 187 to correct a grammatical error and otherwise traversed the rejection and the objection. Examiner responded with an advisory action in which Examiner indicated that she would enter the amendment for purposes of appeal but that she was persisting in her rejection of the amended claims as anticipated by Buteau.

Applicants are now filing a second RCE with this *Submission*, which amends Applicant's claims to claim the invention more generically and to better distinguish them from systems like those disclosed in Buteau which are not usable by people who are not information technology specialists and from collaborative design tools like those disclosed in Knoth, "Tools for a Collaborative World", *Computer-aided Engineering*, April 1997 (henceforth "Knoth"), which has been cited in USSN 10/765,424, which is a CIP of the present patent application.

Please amend the claims as follows: